

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/820,740	TENG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Alan Cariaso	2875	

All Participants:

Status of Application: 93

(1) Alan Cariaso.

(3) _____.

(2) John Guice, Reg. no. 39699.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 5 September 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
None

Claims discussed:
1 and 5


Prior art documents discussed:
None

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the ^{Supplemental} Notice of Allowability. *tc*
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 ALAN CARIASO
 PRIMARY EXAMINER
 (Examiner/PE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner informed attorney that there was a discrepancy in the claims, namely that the claimed recitation "materials to form said wires comprise metals" in claim 5, dependent on claim 1, was incompatible with the recitation "each of the wires ... is made of polymer" in claim 1. It was observed that the specification supports that the wires are made of either polymer or metal, and not in any combination thereof. Therefore, it was agreed to cancel claim 5 by examiner's amendment, included herewith..